

09/153,831
REMARKS

Claims 5, 6 and 13-16 have been objected to as being indefinite and claims 1, 2 and 7-10 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Gefvert in view of newly cited Greenberger. Claims 3, 4 and 11-17 have been indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the attached amended claims and following considerations.

With respect to the indefiniteness of claims 5 and 6, they have been amended to make "loudspeakers" in claim 5 singular and more accurately refer back to claims 1 and 2, respectively. These claims now properly refer back to the single loudspeaker of claim 1 and single mirror-imaged sound fields of claim 2, respectively. The plurality (of loudspeakers) of claim 5 or plurality (of mirror-imaged sound fields) of claim 6 are shown in FIG. 39.

Claims 13-16 specify "drivers" or "channel signals," not loudspeakers. The single loudspeaker of claim 1 can have two, three or more drivers or channel signals, as shown in FIGs. 29 or 31 and 32 and can be stacked, as shown in FIG. 29. Alternatively, the multiple loudspeakers of FIG. 39 can each have two, three or more drivers or channel signals. Claims 5, 6 and 13-16 are now believed definite.

Independent claims 1 and 2 have been amended to include the limitations of claim 11, previously indicated to be allowable, and claim 11 has been cancelled. Claims 3-10 and 12-17 all incorporate claims 1 or 2 by reference, therefore claims 1-10 and 12-17 are now believed allowable.

In addition, new claims 18-25 have been added. New claims 18-21 incorporate claim 1 by reference and delineate certain other features of the invention. New independent claim 22 is an apparatus claim that includes the limitations of previous claim 11 and therefore should be allowable. New claims 23 and 24 incorporate claim 22 by reference, and new claim 25 is a method claim that includes the limitation of previous claim 11; therefore, these claims should also be allowable. Independent claims 22 and 25 were added to leave out certain other limitations present in claims 1 and 2. Therefore, the application is now believed to be in order for allowance.